



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

cal sense and the verse rhythm require that it be otherwise read. Thus, on this basis, for example, p. 56, out of twelve lines six are perfect classical Alexandrines. To cite two lines given as Romantic:

Laissez.—Tous ces enfants sont bien là.—Qui vous dit.

Pleure. Les pleurs sont bien, même au bonheur; tes chants.

From this view-point the statistics, as given by the author, would be lower by at least 40%. The works which the author has examined of V. Hugo belong to his first period of authorship: in the *Odes et Ballades* 1/10%, in the *Orientales* 1%, in the *Feuilles d'Automne* 1 2/5% are Romantic lines. Of the 2176 lines in *Hernani* 175 are Romantic; Dr. Matzke's results are quite different; he finds 553 Romantic lines. Müller evidently did not know of this investigation.

As striking rhymes in V. Hugo, the following are cited: mer-blasphemer; apostasier-hier. They are frequent in Lamartine; one example in de Musset and Vigny. Monsieur-crieur found in Hugo and Lamartine. Rich rhyme is more frequent in the Romantic than in the classical poetry; but these statistics are based on only a few poems. In V. Hugo rich rhyme is used especially in poems in which beauty of form is aimed at.

General conclusion: the Romantic poets, in the main, adhere to the general laws of versification; we have occasional variations. Hiatus law is strictly observed. French verse received from the Romantic school, especially from V. Hugo, a greater pliability and freedom by the free use of the hemistich, frequent use of overflow, and rich rhyme.

From this review we are led to the question: What results are here obtained? The answer is, the work *est à refaire*. The most serious defect is the failure to consult and apply verse bibliography, and to examine all the works of the poets under question and in chronological order.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

#### ENGLISH LITERATURE.

*The Works of Thomas Kyd*. Edited from the original texts, with introduction, notes, and facsimiles. By FREDERICK S. BOAS, M. A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1901. 8vo, pp. cxvi, 470.

THE edition of Kyd's works by Prof. Boas will

be of very great service to students of the Elizabethan drama. During the past few years the way has been prepared for such a collection by the biographical researches of Prof. Schick and Mr. Sidney Lee; by many investigations in respect to Kyd's authorship of various plays, notably Prof. Sarrazin's *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis*; and by scholarly editions of the *Spanish Tragedy* by Prof. Schick and Prof. Manly. In a long introduction Prof. Boas has discussed and added to the results of these preceding investigators. While many problems in regard to Kyd are perplexing and do not admit of conclusive demonstration, Prof. Boas has in general shown accuracy and judgment in his discussion of conflicting evidence, and a thorough knowledge of the work of his predecessors, except of Prof. Manly's edition of the *Spanish Tragedy*, which strangely enough is not even mentioned. Particularly interesting is his discussion of Kyd's biography. He has discovered among the Harleian MSS. documents bearing on the charges of atheism made against Kyd and Marlowe shortly before the death of the latter. Kyd appears in the unenviable position of casting all the blame upon Marlowe. The chief value of the book, however, naturally lies in the trustworthy texts of the *Spanish Tragedy*, *Cornelia*, *Soliman and Perseda*, the *House holders Philosophie* (a translation from Tasso), the *Murder of John Brewen*, and the *First Part of Jeronimo*.

Prof. Boas has retained the spelling of the original texts and carefully collated all extant editions. A comparison of his texts with those in volume V of Hazlitt's *Dodsley* affords an interesting illustration of the advance made in the last thirty years in this field of English scholarship. It is to be hoped that the bulk of the Elizabethan plays may eventually be reprinted with similar accuracy. In one or two particulars, however, there is room for a word of criticism. Prof. Boas in a few cases changes the spelling of proper names in order to preserve uniformity. It is difficult to see what advantage there is in uniformity of spelling Elizabethan proper names. On the other hand, Mr. Fleay and Mr. Boyle have found in different spellings of the same name indications of different authors. While the value of this test may not be well established, still any variation in text which may offer the slightest aid to critical research might well be retained.

In the division of the plays into acts and scenes Prof. Boas's practice is also open to question. The main purpose of the division into scenes in a modern edition is to facilitate reference; but in the four modern editions of the *Spanish Tragedy* we have four different arrangements. Reference to the play is consequently not facilitated in the least. Prof. Boas differs in only a few cases from Prof. Manly and Prof. Schick, but these cases raise questions on which there might well be a consensus of opinion for the benefit of future editors of Elizabethan plays. The Choruses at the beginning or end of each act are marked as scenes by Boas and Schick but not by Manly, whose practice is in accord with precedent in the case of Shakespeare. Several other divergences will be noted; Schick certainly is contrary to Elizabethan custom in marking scene xv in Act iii; the preference between the divisions of Manly and Boas is hard to determine. The notes supplied by Prof. Boas for the texts are excellent.

In regard to the most debated questions of authorship, he comes to the conclusions that Kyd was the author of *Soliman and Perseda*, and the *Ur Hamlet*, but not of the *First Part of Jeronimo*.

Of the last conclusion he is the most certain and advances a number of arguments in addition to those proposed by Dr. Rudolf Fischer against Kyd's authorship. The *First Part of Jeronimo* seems to Prof. Boas utterly unworthy of the author of the *Spanish Tragedy*, very different from that play in style and characterization, and incompatible with it in the account of the love affair of Andrea and Bell-imperia. Differences in style and characterization cannot be considered of much weight in the case of an author known by one play, especially when we remember similar differences in the plays of Greene, or the two parts of the *Honest Whore*, or in the plays of other dramatists. Prof. Boas's other arguments are, if anything, less conclusive.

The entries in Henslow's *Diary* for 1592 indicate, as Prof. Boas concludes, that there was a companion piece to the *Spanish Tragedy*, produced by way of introduction on the afternoon

1 Zur Kunstentwicklung der Englischen Tragödie. Strassburg, 1893.

before, or a day or two earlier. It is styled by Henslow, "the comodey of done oracio," "the comodey of Jeronymo," "spanes comodye donne oracoe." The version of the *First Part of Jeronimo* which we have was printed in 1605, the year in which the Queen's Revels (Children of the Chapel) were in serious difficulties and in which a number of their plays were printed.<sup>2</sup> The allusions to the short stature of Jeronimo show that the play was acted by a children's company, and we learn from the Induction to the *Malcontent* that the Queen's Revels had misappropriated *Jeronimo* (either one or both of the Jeronimo plays). The date when the *First Part* was first acted by the children probably was not 1604, as Boas assumes, for the *Malcontent* was acted 1603-4 in retaliation<sup>3</sup> by the King's men, and *Jeronimo* must have been acted earlier by the children of the chapel—probably about 1600 as stated by Fleay<sup>4</sup> and Small,<sup>5</sup> and as indicated by the allusion to the year of Jubilee (1600) in Act I, scene 1.

The play, as we have it, then, seems likely to be the early "comodey of Jeronymo," altered and abridged for the children. Alterations may be found in the references to Jeronimo's size and the year of jubilee, surely on no "purely arbitrary hypothesis" (Boas xlii). Indications of abridgment are the shortness of the play, less than one-half the length of the *Spanish Tragedy*, the combination of a short and a long line in rhyming couplets, and the very short parts assigned to some important personages. Don Pedro, Duke Medina, Vol-lupo, and the Duke of Castile have but a few words each. Some of the divergences between the *First Part* and the *Spanish Tragedy* may be plausibly laid to such abridgment, especially the failure of the *First Part* to set forth the secret nature of the love of Bell-imperia and Andrea—a divergence to which Prof. Boas attaches great importance. He observes:

2 In 1605-6. The Dutch Courtesan, All Fools, Eastward Ho, the Fleire, the Fawn, the Gentleman Usher, Isle of Gulls, Monsieur D'Olive, Sir Giles Goosecappe, Sophonisba.

3 Cf. *The Stage Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the Postasters*. R. A. Small, 1899, pp. 114-5.

4 *Chronicle of the Drama*, ii. 27. Fleay finds a plausible argument in a reference in *Cynthia's Revels*.

5 Small, *The Stage Quarrel*, etc., p. 124, note.

"when Lazarotto reveals the whole story in the presence of Castile, [Bell-imperia's father] the Duke utters no word of surprise or anger" [xlii].

But the only words which the duke utters in the whole course of the play are, "I, Don Rogero" (i, 1). The part had presumably been greatly cut. Now, the *Spanish Tragedy* refers to many events prior to the opening of the action and these cannot be said "to relate chiefly to the secret love between Andrea and Bell-Imperia" [Boas, xli.], but rather to the whole love-affair, the war and the death of Andrea. Whatever discrepancies may be noted between the two plays, nevertheless the *First Part* does present in the main the story of the events which the *Spanish Tragedy* requires. Surely, then, we are justified in accepting the 1605 quarto as representing the companion piece of the *Spanish Tragedy* of 1592.

Whether this version in any way represents Kyd is a more complex question, but the facts of the stage-history incline one to exercise much more caution than does Prof. Boas in rejecting it as spurious. The natural inferences from those facts seem to forbid his endorsement of the conclusion of Rudolf Fischer,

"that it is the work of a journeyman playwright who found in the Induction to *The Spanish Tragedy* hints from which he manufactured this crude melodrama, whose title served as a decoy to the theatre-going public, and which has had the effect, doubtless unforeseen by its author, of fatally injuring the fame of Kyd." [Introduction xlv.]

When a few pages later on the evidence of an allusion to "Cues and Ceas," Prof. Boas declares, "Some 'wit' reared at Cambridge was responsible for *The First Part of Jeronimo*," one must note this as one of the very few occasions when he has confused doubtful conjecture and fact.

His discussion of *Soliman and Perseda* is not open to this charge. On the contrary, the evidences, wholly internal, are presented with a discriminating sense of their values. The chief objection to assigning the play to Kyd is the character of Basilisco. If we must rely on æsthetic opinions, many will probably find it easier to believe that Kyd wrote a good deal of the melodramatic *First Part* than to believe that even with the aid of classical prototypes

he could have created this admirably humorous braggart, whom Prof. Schick has with justice called "by far the most remarkable Elizabethan precursor of Falstaff." Prof. Boas, however, credits Kyd with "Sophoclean dramatic irony" and other traits not very evident to most of us; consequently he makes little difficulty of Basilisco and concludes that the play was by Kyd or—less probably—a disciple.

In the discussion of the *Ur-Hamlet*—as in that of *Soliman and Perseda*—while Prof. Boas agrees with Sarrazin's main conclusion, he submits the evidence advanced by the latter to a thorough reconsideration. He rules the German *Bestrafte Brudermord* out of consideration, resting on Tanger's conclusion

"that this piece is nothing more than a version of the *First Quarto*, with probably a few later additions due to actors familiar with Shakespeare's play in its later form" (xlviii).

Even if Tanger's criticism of Creizenach's analysis seems more conclusive than it does to the present writer, it is still difficult to believe that the pirated and mangled *First Quarto* was largely responsible for the German play. The hypothesis that it goes back to the *Ur-Hamlet* seems more plausible; and the theory that the *Ur-Hamlet* was by Kyd in the style of the *Spanish Tragedy* adds considerably to the probability of this hypothesis. Whatever view is assumed in regard to the German play, however, there is plenty of chance for objection; and Prof. Boas's course at least has the advantage of ruling that troublesome abridgment out of the discussion. It has, on the other hand, the very serious disadvantage of compelling him to confine the internal evidences of Kyd's authorship of the *Ur-Hamlet* to the resemblances between Kyd's plays and the *First Quarto*. The resting of any case on the *First Quarto* is precarious business, and this part of the introduction will doubtless encounter much dissent, especially from those who find it difficult to believe that there is anything in *Hamlet* not due to Shakespeare's genius. Even those who agree with Boas in finding resemblances to Kyd in the quarto will have some trouble in accepting his sweeping statement:

"The bulk of the blank verse in the three later Acts is, in my opinion, unmistakably pre-

Shakespearean. The vocabulary and the rhythm are not those of the master-dramatist at any stage of his career, while in Kyd's works they may be frequently paralleled" (Intro. xlix).

His list of parallels, however, is certainly valuable and, perhaps, as convincing as such evidence can be.

The main evidence for Kyd's authorship is, of course, Nash's allusion in his Epistle to Greene's *Menaphon*. Boas makes rather too much difficulty out of phrases which Prof. Ward has thought to point to Kyd as expressing "the University man's contempt for Latin not learnt on the Cam or Isis."<sup>6</sup> Though Prof. MacCallum has recently summed up effectively the objections to Kyd,<sup>7</sup> most students now probably agree with him that the balance of evidence is in favor of Kyd. Prof. Boas has added to the evidence offered by Sarrazin, but the case for Kyd still stands substantially where Sarrazin left it. Nash's allusion fits Kyd better than anyone else. The early *Hamlet* in plot and general character was probably similar to the *Spanish Tragedy*. Similarities to Kyd may plausibly be discovered in the *First Quarto*, the German play, and for that matter in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

The nature of Shakespeare's treatment of the early play is a problem too complex for discussion here, but we may note a dissent from the conjectures of Prof. Boas in regard to the history of the early play. The allusions to it, covering fifteen years, indicate a greater popularity than he grants it. Moreover, while it "probably underwent in manuscript form a certain amount of adaptation," we can by no means assent to the surmise that its "popularized stage version" which Shakespeare had for a basis,

"would have had something of the same relation to the *Ur-Hamlet* as Ayer's German adaptation of the *Spanish Tragedie* has to its original" (liii note).

This conjecture is as unfounded as it is unnecessary. Boas is driven to it because "we do not find in the *Quarto* some features of style characteristic of the author of *The Spanish Tragedie*" (liii). But why should we? Almost

all "features of style" are lacking in that production. The early *Hamlet* may have been as much altered as the *First Part of Jeronimo* seems to have been, or it may have had as unmolested an existence as did many other Elizabethan plays, which remained for years in MS. So far as probabilities go, we may conjecture that if Kyd wrote a *Hamlet* in 1588, Shakespeare was tolerably familiar with the play and could have found a fairly integral copy in 1601.

In discussing the *Spanish Tragedy*, Prof. Boas is on less debatable ground. This is the one play which we can certainly ascribe to Kyd, at least until some ingenious critic twists Heywood's lines. If the authorship, however, is settled, the date is not. Prof. Boas concludes that the evidence suggests a date 1585-7, but he does not consider an interesting question which this early date raises. *Tamburlaine* is generally assigned to 1587, and if the *Spanish Tragedy* preceded *Tamburlaine*, we must make some important changes in our notions of the extent and importance of Marlowe's innovations. If the *Spanish Tragedy* with its blank-verse, its central heroic figure, its partial success in infusing passion into an old narrative, its blood and thunder, its soliloquies, and its "high astounding terms," preceded *Tamburlaine*, Prof. Boas would be justified in giving much more attention than he does to Kyd's influence on Elizabethan tragedy. As a matter of fact, the evidence for the date is very uncertain and by no means forbids a later date than 1587.

In examining this evidence, Prof. Boas has surely been led into an error in thinking that "when Nash speaks of the authors who 'attract infection' by spending 'two or three howers in turning over French *Doudie*' he may be referring to Kyd's imitation"

of a passage in *Cornelie* (Int. xxix). He has perhaps been misled by an unfortunate passage in Prof. Schick's introduction to the play. He declared that in Nash's jest, "a splendid vista of literary connection is opened to our imagination,"<sup>8</sup> and

"there is hardly any doubt that the passage in the main refers to the translation of certain

6 *A History of English Dramatic Literature*, ed. 1899. I. 312, note.

7 *The Furnivall Miscellany*. "The Authorship of the Early *Hamlet*," p. 282 ff.

8 *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. by Schick. Intro. xlii. The whole passage is a notable example of perverted ingenuity.

plays in French by the head of the French Senecans, Robert Garnier."

He also indulged in an astonishing identification of 'Dowdy' and 'Didon'; "the Dowdy may refer to a play with the title 'Didon'—Jodelle's, for instance (cf. 'Dido a Dowdy,' *Romeo and Juliet*, ii, iv, 43)." The meaning of 'Dowdy' is plain enough as the passage from *Romeo and Juliet* might suggest, and the rest of Nash's joke has an unmistakable meaning which need not be dwelt on. Surely there is no literary reference. If one must look for literary connections, attention might be called to Mr. Fleay's mention of a parallel passage in Greene's Address prefixed to *Perimedes* (1588), alluding to Marlowe and possibly Kyd as "too much frequenting the hot-house;"<sup>9</sup> this is enough to recall the abundance of such "unpleasantries" as Nash's in Elizabethan plays and pamphlets.

In general, it may be added, Prof. Boas is somewhat too eager to find something in Kyd's career to fit every word of Nash's oft-discussed paragraph. It may possibly refer to more than one dramatist; and at all events our knowledge of Kyd's life is still too meagre to enable us to determine all the references with any certainty. Mr. Fleay's example ought to be a warning against exercising too much ingenuity over Elizabethan allusions.

It may be questioned, however, whether Fleay's theories in regard to Kyd should be dismissed as summarily as they are by Boas. No subject in connection with the Elizabethan drama offers a more valuable field for research than the works of Mr. Fleay; the first step in any investigation may well be to search out what he has discovered, conjectured, misplaced, or forgotten. His ascription to Kyd of the *Taming of the Shrew* might at least have received some attention. Prof. Boas barely mentions this and occupies only three pages in rejecting *Titus Andronicus*, partly on the ground of "a significant difference of atmosphere" between it and the *Spanish Tragedy*. Apart from the suggestion that Kyd may have influenced for the better Marlowe's technique and construction of plots during their association 1590-2, the rest of the discussion of Kyd's influence on the drama is confined largely to

<sup>9</sup> *Chronicle of the Drama* ii, 31-2.

tracing parallel passages and allusions to the *Spanish Tragedy*. After such a list of parallels in Shakespeare, we are surprised to learn that "his debt to Kyd is scarcely, if at all, less than to Marlowe himself" (p. lxxxiii). But the real extent of this indebtedness is hardly hinted at. Shakespeare and the rest of the Elizabethan dramatists owe more to Marlowe than to Kyd, but they owe much to the innovator who adapted Seneca into a genuine English drama, and who created an important type of tragedy. The influence of Kyd's technique and his choice and treatment of dramatic motives might be traced in the plays of Marston, Chapman, Tourneur, and Webster as well as Shakespeare. The omission of any mention of *Antonio and Melinda* in Prof. Boas' discussion is at least curious. But he does not see fit to pay much attention to Kyd's historical position and importance, either his relation to the preceding followers of Seneca or his influence on succeeding authors of 'revenge' tragedies.

This neglect is not because of a slight estimate of Kyd's genius. On the contrary, the introduction exhibits an enthusiastic and sympathetic appreciation of both his work and his personality. We may find the enthusiasm justified which defends the *Spanish Tragedy* against the contempt which it has frequently received, for the play has irony, and a sense of fate, and some genuine passion. But Prof. Boas occasionally forgets that its dramatic art is crude, and that it is æsthetically interesting more for what it tries to express than for what it actually achieves. In a single page (xxxvii) we are told that "Kyd displays incontestable dramatic genius," that "he reproduces something of that Sophoclean dramatic irony which is among the crowning glories of the Attic stage," that

"beneath the ripple of gay discourse on so trivial a theme as the arrangements for an amateur performance we catch the solemn undertone of an ever-nearing catastrophe."

In the epilogue, we learn,

"echoes of Virgilian music temper the harsher strain, and glimpses are given us of Hieronimo and his loved ones amidst the Elysian fields—glimpses that help to make us less forlorn" (p. xxxix).

May not the discovery of such emotions in so wooden a production as the *Spanish Tragedy* be attributed to the Pathetic Fallacy?

Kyd himself has become a very real figure to his editor. From the meagre facts of his career, a picture is drawn to move our pity. His plays are found to illuminate his personality. He is discovered to have been "a man of sombre and rigid temperament"—possibly on the external evidence of Nash's jest already alluded to, and the internal evidence in the character of Basilisco. He had a "quickened sensibility of vision into the darker phases of human character and destiny;" and this inference we may more surely refer to the character of Lorenzo, in which Prof. Boas takes a psychological interest. Some readers may find relief from the careful examination of facts and balancing of evidence in such flights into the region of sentimental fancy. The funeral oration pronounced on Kyd (pp. lxxvii, lxxviii) is certainly both imaginative and eloquent.

Other readers will not have enough sensibility of vision to seek in the plays of Kyd for either hidden gems or indications of the author's view of life; and these will regret that Prof. Boas has occasionally abandoned the historical point of view for that of modern æsthetic criticism. His aberrations in literary judgment, we must hasten to add, give only a momentary annoyance and by no means affect an appreciation of the painstaking and judicious scholarship manifest throughout the book. And if this review has emphasized some points which occasion dissent, instead of dwelling on the many additions which have been made to our knowledge of Kyd, it is only because even slight corrections and trivial criticisms seem worth noting in the case of a book which must in many respects serve as a model for future editors of the dramatists.

In the note on the Earl of Gloucester's invasion of Portugal (p. 397) mention should be made of the play "the Honorable Life of the Humorous Earl of Gloster, with his conquest of Portugal" (Henslow's *Diary*, 1601) and of the reference to this expedition at the end of *Look About You* (cf. Fleay, *Chronicle* ii, 226, 227). References to Tanger's discussions of the first quarto of Hamlet in *Anglia and the Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society*, might well accompany the reference to his article in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (xlviij). The statement that in Lorenzo "the Machiavellian 'politician' makes his entry upon the Eliza-

bethan stage" (xxxiii)—might well have a reference to the discussion of this matter by Dr. Edward Meyer in his *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama*. The quotation from Nash (xx, xxi) is without reference. The entry for "7 of jeneverary" (p. xi) in Henslow's *Diary* occurs twice in Collier's edition; on p. 79 for £7 and on p. 84 for £3. On p. xxxi, l. 15; for i. x, read i. i. 10. On p. xciv, l. 12; for iii. ii, 43, read iii. xi, 43.

A. H. THORNDIKE.

Western Reserve University.

### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Der Arme Heinrich* by HARTMANN VON DER AUE, edited with an Introduction, Notes and Glossary, by JOHN G. ROBERTSON, M. A., B. Sc., Ph. D., London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan & Co., 1895. 8vo, pp. xviii, 122.\*

THE editor's expression of fear (Preface, p. i), lest his edition of *Der Arme Heinrich* in English be considered superfluous and unwarranted, together with his subsequent vindication of his undertaking, call to mind such work as the translation into English of Kluge's *Etymol. Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* and of certain German monographs and treatises on Germanic subjects, also the compiling of Grammars of Germanic dialects in the face of most excellent books on those subjects in German. One cannot help thinking, in the same connection, of the rapid multiplication of text editions and grammars, both in Germany and in this country. Existing conditions render much of this work inevitable, yet one is led to question most seriously the advisability and value of doing a large portion of it. However, the same objection that one feels here, cannot quite be urged against an English edition of *Der Arme Heinrich*, so long as, for the better or the worse, MHG. remains the first Germanic dialect to which *angehende Germanisten* are introduced, and so long as *Der Arme Heinrich* maintains its position as the first MHG. text *par excellence*. We believe, therefore, with the editor that there is room for a book like his, but the presumption in such a case certainly is with the older standard editions, and the burden of proof rests upon the new book

\* See Vol. xii, 1897, pp. 93-94, of this Journal.